

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: I would like to ask Delegate Dulany a question, as to why he has used the word "spouse" instead of the word "wife".

THE PRESIDENT: He has not used any of these words. He has used only the word "dependent". He has stricken all the other words. The amendment is modified; you perhaps did not understand. Let me give you the proposed new modification of the amendment.

Delegate Dulany, I think it might be simpler to rewrite the amendment. May I state it in this manner: Amend section 1.12 by inserting after the word "obligation" in line 41 the words "for the support of a dependent or for alimony" and strike out all of lines 44 and 45 except the word "shall".

Is that the amendment?

DELEGATE DULANY: That is correct.

THE PRESIDENT: If that amendment is made the section would read "No person shall be imprisoned for debt, but an obligation for the support of a dependent or for alimony created by a valid decree of a court by an agreement approved by decree of a court shall not constitute a debt within the meaning of this section."

Delegate Mentzer.

DELEGATE MENTZER: It is a pleasure to welcome all members of the Committee to the Committee on Style.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to considering the amendment as Amendment No. 9 even though it is not printed?

The Chair hears none. Amendment No. 9. Delegate Boyles.

DELEGATE BOYLES: Mr. Chairman, does that not mean, then, that the phrase "created by a valid decree of the court", and so forth, is the dependent created by the valid decree of the court? Is this the intention?

I am not trying to write legal language, but my English tells me the court does not create the dependent.

THE PRESIDENT: I would not think so, Delegate Boyles, if it is punctuated properly. "An obligation for the support of a dependent or for alimony, created by", I think would be clear.

Delegate Burdette.

DELEGATE BURDETTE: Perhaps, Mr. President, you have solved the prob-

lem by using the comma, although I think it is a little dubious.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think at least the problem for the Committee on Style is a little less.

Is there any objection to considering the amendment even though not printed? The Chair hears none.

That is Amendment No. 9.

Delegate Dulany.

DELEGATE DULANY: Mr. President, I do not know that I should add anything. I think we have cleared up the language of the section.

THE PRESIDENT: I think everybody understands.

Delegate Carson, would that solve your problem so that Amendment No. 8 could be withdrawn?

DELEGATE CARSON: Almost, Mr. Chairman. I think if you added the words "created by" in front of "an agreement", then you would have made it clear. It is not totally clear yet. Then it would read "an obligation for the support of a dependent or for alimony, created by a valid decree of a court or created by an agreement approved by a decree."

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to the further modification?

Delegate Carson.

DELEGATE CARSON: Mr. Chairman, in light of that, I will at this time withdraw my amendment.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well, Amendment No. 8 is withdrawn. Amendment No. 9 is before you.

Is there any discussion?

Delegate Bamberger.

DELEGATE BAMBERGER: I would like to be certain, Mr. President, that the word "dependent" does always include illegitimate children.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I would think, just to answer it myself, in the context in which it is read, an obligation for the support of a dependent would be for the support of a person who was in the status of a dependent regardless of his relationship, whether he had no relationship if he were in fact dependent.

Is that what is intended, Delegate Dulany?